

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

VOL. 2.

"YE SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—JESUS CHRIST.

NO. 3.

| \$1 50 in advance. |

PROVIDENCE, R. I. SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1825.

| \$2 at the end of the year. |

CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY,

By BARZILLAI CRANSTON,

At No. 8, North Main-Street (3d story) near the Market-House.

Rev. DAVID PICKERING, Editor.

Agents who procure five subscribers, and become responsible for the same, will be allowed one paper extra, and in the same ratio for a greater number.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.

TOTAL DEPRAVITY.

(CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 5.)

In prosecuting this subject further, we will endeavor to modify its principles in some measure in continuing to illustrate them by asking those who believe this article of faith of the orthodox doctrine—Why call upon sinners to pray, repent, believe, and attend to all the means of grace, if they are *entirely* destitute of any true inherent holiness? We might as well call upon a mechanic, say a clock-maker, to manufacture and put together a time-piece or a watch, without having any proper materials or tools to work with, as to *enforce* any religious injunctions on a being *wholly* incapable of conceiving the true nature of *vital piety*. According to orthodox reasoning, it appears fairly that the soul may, without any difficulty, discover the *intrinsic merit* or *value* of *natural things*, but cannot *discern spiritual* ones. Now, we would ask from this idea, what kind of a thing is the *soul*? If the *soul* were made "in the image of God," and as such is *totally depraved*, would not this make the original fountain from whence it is derived, verily *impure*? Certainly it would. For it is denied by none, but what God is the *sole creator* and *disposer* of all intelligent beings; and if this be true, then, every infant child that is born into this world receives its soul from God—and if it come from God totally depraved, then it proves to a demonstration that God is himself *depraved*! What an absurd idea is this for orthodox divines and people to embrace and teach, which leads to such a *preposterous* conclusion—But, may heaven and every thing that is sacred forbid the idea; never let the thought be harbored in any human breast, that God is an *impure* being!—and unless *he is*, it is impossible in the nature of things for the doctrine, *total depravity*, to be *true* in any shape. But, however, we do allow and grant that *every thing* on earth is undeniably stamped with *imperfection*, there is no perfection, separate from imperfection, to be found here—because all things are suited to the state in which they are placed. Wisdom and goodness are displayed in all God's works, and he, who denies this, impeaches his holy character with the foulest stain. But God is true, and may he be loved, adored and praised "for his wonderful works unto the children of men!"

We will now mention a few passages of scripture

in order to show the utter absurdity of the doctrine. Solomon says, "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord." It appears from this passage that our "lot is cast," i. e. man is placed here for some wise purpose or other, and the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord." If man be totally depraved, then he is, according to this verse, made so by the Lord—and he disposes him so *to be* and *to do*. This conclusion is *just*, allowing the doctrine to be true—If the Lord disposes of his conduct as he pleases, then of course total depravity is from the Lord, and who in the name of wonder can prevent it? What an inconsistent idea to entertain of the Almighty; and it must be so according to the reasoning of those who believe it.

Another passage worthy of notice may be found in Jer. x. 23. "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." We would query, does the Lord direct the steps of a totally depraved man, and if he do not, how can that be true in Jeremiah, "it is *not in man* that walketh to direct his steps." If man be totally depraved, originally, then the Lord must direct his steps just as much in that situation, as though he were *regenerated*. What difference is it to the Lord whether we are totally depraved or wholly righteous? For we are equally under the divine protection, and we do actually find by daily observation, that those who *pretend* to have met with a *spiritual change*, do not prosper any better, nor manifest any more resignation to God's will, to human appearance, than others do, whom *they* significantly call the *world's* or *morally good* people. When God commanded Adam and Eve to "be fruitful, multiply, and replenish the earth," how strange it must be to think that he should fill the world with totally depraved beings—and yet all created with a rational *soul* and "after his *image*."

The last passage to be brought forward at this time to prove the absurdity of this doctrine is found in James i. 17.—"Every good gift, and every perfect gift is from above." We ask again, what kind of a "good and perfect gift" would it be, to make a being, possessing superior and refined faculties, yet totally depraved? For it is allowed by the orthodox, as we have suggested before, that a person may be very amiable, useful in society, do much good, possess much sympathy, liberality and honesty, and all these qualifications we call and are certainly "*good gifts*," and yet, such a person, it is contended, may be totally depraved. We ask now, how can *two natures* so different one from the other, exist or dwell in the same *identical* person? We say positively, notwithstanding some great names on the other side of the question, that it is *impossible*. The *scriptures* strongly and unequivocally testify against it; *reason* never *can* and never *will* sanction what the *scriptures* deny, and *common sense* will always discard in the strongest terms what the *scriptures* and reason uni-

tedly reject. If total depravity be true, can this be called "a good and perfect gift," for it is contended that young children or infants are as much in this situation from their births, as are adults. In this respect one is as bad as the other. As God creates all, "and in him we live, move, and have our being," then it will be proved undeniably, that the infinite Jehovah has bestowed upon his *own* offspring *total depravity* as one of his "good and perfect gifts:" we say this is undeniable if the doctrine in question be true—What a "good and perfect gift" total depravity is? It is assuredly a "good" doctrine for it is a "*good gift*." Hence we infer, any thing that is "*perfect or good*," may with propriety be considered "*total*." Therefore, a *good and perfect gift* in scripture is synonymous to "*total depravity*," as used by orthodox divines and doctors. We say that this reasoning is as conclusive to prove the last assertion, as it is contended by our opposers that *they* prove their own doctrine.

The words of St. James, when properly weighed and fully considered will *forever* set this subject at rest, as well as innumerable other passages which speak fully against it. St. James says, "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man. But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." Here observe, kind reader, it says, "man is drawn away of his *own* lust." How can this be, if he be totally depraved? He cannot add nor diminish to the depravity which he brings into the world with him—for it is pronounced *total*. Now we would candidly query, how can a man be drawn away of his *own* lust, when he is made *wholly* depraved? Would not total depravity be sufficient to make any person *evil* enough and as sinful as he ought or could be, without using his *own* lust! Assuredly. Or what in the name of wonder cannot a man do, if he can make *himself* totally depraved, then of course he can make *himself* *totally righteous* just as well! There would be no propriety in the term, "drawn away of his *own* lust," if we are totally depraved, for in this case we should "sin as it were with a cart rope," with the very nature that we are made with and no other. "Our *own* lust" is out of the question entirely. For if we use the *evil* that we are created with, and being *full* of it, we cannot, therefore, conveniently find any use *for our own* if we wished too. Now, kind reader, which should you think reasoned most correctly, St. James, or our doctors of divinity and others who have styled themselves "legates of the skies," and heaven's ambassadors. "*Judge ye*."

We cannot enlarge any more on this subject at the present time, and have said more than we originally intended, for our communications must be as brief and comprehensive as possible, and it is hoped that this one will be sufficiently intelligible to be

properly understood and fairly interpreted. The main design and scope of this imperfect piece is to detect error, promote liberal inquiry, ennoble man who is the noblest part of God's creation, favor the truth, let the gospel have free course and be glorified, stem the tide of opposition to universal benevolence and love, and help to throw off those heavy oppressive burdens of superstition, bigotry, prejudice, ignorance, which abound too much, and endeavor to convince enthusiastic zealots who love the praise of men, more than of God. We will close in recommending to our opposers *strictly* the words of St. Paul—Gal. iii. 28, 29.—“There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are *all one* in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the *promise*.”

R. C * * * *

Middleboro', Aug. 11. 1825.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN TELESCOPE.
CENSORIOUSNESS.

“*Him that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.*” John viii. 7.

The words here quoted are an answer given by our Saviour to the Pharisees, who brought to him a woman taken in adultery. “They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. When they continued asking him, he lifted himself up and said unto them, he that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone at her. And they which heard it being convicted by their own conscience went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up himself and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, no man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, neither do I condemn thee: Go and sin no more.” In this narration we have a description of a class of men, who lived in the days of our Saviour, and perhaps no age of the world since has been entirely exempt from them. They went about to establish their own righteousness by condemning others. They were not content to condemn those only who were guilty of some offence, but tempted the innocent Saviour, that they might induce him to say or do something that they might construe as a deviation from the law of Moses, if not a contradiction to it, and thus have a chance of accusing him of error. From the result of this interview we learn the characters of those who appeared so zealous to correct the faults of others. If they were not all adulterers, they were at least guilty of some offences, for which their hearts smote them, when our Saviour made them the above reply. And has it not been true ever since the days of our Saviour, that men who have been the most censorious, and the most ready to condemn and execute others for the least fault, have been themselves highly criminal? Our Saviour who has given us an example to follow, has exhibited a spirit directly the reverse of the above. Al-

though he knew the woman's heart and conduct, and needed not that any should testify against her, he did not condemn her, but warned her against the consequences of her conduct and exhorted her to repentance; for he felt compassion for her as a sinner, and sought not her destruction, but her reformation and happiness. And I will venture to assert, that every one who possesses the spirit of Christ, when he hears of or beholds the faults of any of his fellow-beings, especially those faults which are not founded in malice and guile, feels compassion for them. And perhaps the latter class of offenders ought to be viewed with compassion, as our Saviour prayed for his enemies on the cross, saying, “Father forgive them for they know not what they do.” If we all felt anxious for the reformation, salvation and happiness of all men, and acted consistently, the face of society would wear a much more pleasing aspect, and others would take knowledge of us that we had been with Jesus.

PHILO.

REVIEW OF MR. FISK'S EXAMINATION.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 6.)

In attempting to meet our arguments against the doctrine of future endless misery, founded upon the total silence of the Hebrew Law-giver respecting such a supposed state of rewards, Mr. F. urges that “God was the political Law-giver of the Israelites. That their government was a theocracy; and even their religious ritual was interwoven with their political economy.” And thence concludes that “it is fitting that all sanctions, relating to earthly governments should be of an earthly and temporal nature.” Thus he accounts, in the first section of this argument, for the silence of the Hebrew Law-giver, respecting the doctrine of future punishment. It is scarcely necessary to say to the reader that Mr. F. has here acknowledged that the punishment of the transgressions of that law which God gave to the Hebrews was *temporal*, for he has the acknowledgment of Mr. F. in the above quotation.

Here the reader is requested to observe, that God is the Lawgiver: Consequently it has all the *authority* of a character infinitely dignified to establish its importance. Again, Mr. F. pronounces the punishment of transgressing that law to be *earthly and temporal* in its nature. It will be no relief to the argument of Mr. F. to say that the law was of a political character; for by granting all this, the whole difficulty still remains. God is still the *Law-giver*; and Mr. F. lays it down as a fundamental article, of the sermon, (see page 11. sec. 2.) that “the extent of the criminality of sin, is in proportion to the dignity of the character insulted.” And adds, God is a character infinitely dignified. Therefore,—to sin against God, is a crime of infinite demerit.” Now let us sum up the whole statement. (1) God is the giver of the law: (2) The extent of criminality is in proportion to the dignity of the Law-giver, which is infinite:—Therefore the transgression of this law is of infinite extent and demerit. (3) The punishment of such transgression, he admits, is of an *earthly and temporal* nature. Thus we find him at war with a *fundamental* principle laid down in the Sermon. We shall therefore leave him to dispose of this diffi-

culty in the best manner which his ingenuity can devise: For we confess that it looks so like a plain *contradiction*, that we know of no other name by which to designate it correctly.

Again, Mr. F. asserts that “the Jewish ritual and worship were all typical.” That the *rites and ceremonies* of the Jewish law were *typical*, no one will deny. But is our examiner justified in asserting that their *worship* was *all typical*? Let the nature of the worship enjoined on them decide this important question.

When Christ was asked by a lawyer, “which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.” Matt. xxii. 36—40. The commandments which the Saviour here repeated are recorded in Deut. vi. 5. and Lev. xix. 18. We now ask, was the worship which is required in these commandments merely *typical*? Is not the sincerest homage of the heart embraced in the first of these commandments? Can any commandment be found in the sacred scriptures where a more pure and spiritual worship is enjoined? Was there ever a moral duty enjoined on man, whose importance transcends the one under consideration? And yet Mr. F. asserts that *all the Jewish ritual and worship were typical*. The cause of this assertion appears obvious to us: It was more convenient for the examiner to amuse his readers with some general remarks upon the typical character of the law, than to meet the formidable objection of the Universalists to his theory, predicated upon the silence of the Hebrew Law-giver, as to rewards and punishments in another state of existence. Possibly, he might have forgotten the declaration of the apostle, “The law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.” Rom. vii. 14.

Had Mr. F. succeeded in proving his assertion, that *all the worship* required by the law, was merely *typical*, his remarks would have been more pertinent: but for the assertion, he has adduced no proof; nor do we believe that he will ever hazard the attempt.

The plain fact, and which Mr. F. has been careful to keep out of sight, is, that the law which God gave by Moses has *three distinct branches*. *First*, moral; embracing their duty to *worship, love and fear* the Lord. *Second*, typical; relating to various *offerings, washings* and divers *ordinances*, prefiguring the gospel dispensation and worship. *Third*, political; regulating their policy and conduct as a nation. The *first*, or moral branch of this law is the most important of the three, and has never been abolished; the same duties being still required, through every age of prophetic and gospel instruction. If, therefore, the future endless misery of the transgressor of this law were the just demerit of the sinner, such a penalty would have been revealed, when the consequences of its violation were made known to the children of Israel. But as to any such punishment, the Hebrew Law-giver maintains a total silence; notwithstanding he explains the punishments of transgression under that dispensation, as Mr. F. justly

observes, to be of "an earthly and temporal nature."

Our reviewer tells his readers that Mr. P. makes this statement, (namely, that the rewards and punishments embraced by the law of Moses were the allotments of time,) "because he cannot say the same of other scriptures, especially of the gospel dispensation." If Mr. F. derives any enjoyment by his anticipations, in this respect, we will not, for the present, interrupt them. Perhaps he will understand Mr. P's views on this subject, much better, when he attempts to draw proof of future endless misery from that source.

Mr. F. tells his readers that there are promises under the law which relate to *eternity*; and quotes the declaration of St. Paul, concerning the Israelites, who "all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. That they sought a better country, that is, an heavenly." Heb. xi. 13—16. Now for what purpose did Mr. F. quote this language? was it not for the purpose of proving that the promises of the law of Moses referred us to eternity for their fulfilment? and this to invalidate the argument of the reviewer, which stated that the rewards promised by the law were the allotments of time? If this were not his design, he must have written merely for amusement. If it were his design, we know not what excuse he can urge for such unwarrantable liberties with the sacred writings. Did not Mr. F. know that St. Paul was here speaking of promises which were made, at least, FOUR HUNDRED AND THIRTY YEARS before the giving of the law? Did he not know that this same apostle denominated the promise made to Abraham, &c. the gospel? If he did not, let him read Gal. iii. 8. and then let him decide whether it be not his duty to retrace the steps he has taken, in this instance, lest his own conscience should rise up and accuse him of having deceived the hearts of the simple.

In closing this number, we will just remark, that Mr. F. has endeavoured to make his readers believe that Universalists recognise Christ only as a temporal Saviour. In reply to this charge, nothing more is necessary than simply to say, it is wholly gratuitous. No Universalist, who understood himself, ever believed such a sentiment, nor can such a sentiment be found in their writings.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

AN ATHEIST CONVINCED.

Sir Isaac Newton, having an acquaintance who denied the existence of a Supreme Being, took the following method to convince him of his error upon his own principles. Expecting him upon a visit, he procured a very handsome globe of the starry heavens, which being placed in a corner of the room in which it could not escape his friend's observation, the latter seized the first occasion to ask from whence it came, and to whom it belonged? "Not to me, said Sir Isaac, nor was it ever made by any person, but came here by mere chance!" That, replied his sceptical friend, is absolutely impossible; you surely jest." Sir Isaac, however, seriously persisting in his assertion, took occasion to reason with his friend upon his own atheistical principles. "You will not, said he, believe that this small body origi-

nated in mere chance, and yet you would contend that those heavenly bodies, of which it is only a faint and diminutive resemblance, came into existence without order or design!" Pursuing this chain of reasoning, his friend was at first confounded, in the next place convinced, and ultimately joined in a cordial acknowledgment of the absurdity of denying the existence of a God.

W. H. A.

SELECTIONS.

FROM THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.

THE POWER OF GOD.

Omnipotency in the abstract appears scarcely to admit of erroneous conceptions, or discordant views. — Though all may not have an equally extensive reach of thought upon what is thus unbounded, yet they very generally, if not universally, agree in the use of such abstract terms, in reference to power, as infinity and almighty. These are never understood to mean more than the power of God, but always to extend in their meaning beyond the greatest as well as the least finite capacity. Thus far, then, do all walk together, agreed on this vast subject. This seems very fair indeed, that power Almighty, is power, as much as they can think, or rationally imagine, and that over, above, and after that, there is still power, commonly called infinite. The acknowledgment of the unlimited power of the Deity, in abstract terms, is no less familiar, than it is common, to hear more than infinite power ascribed to the supreme Being, and infinite power not only reduced to finite but sunk into all the characteristics of weakness itself. The great and manifest evidences of power Almighty are referred to as undeniable testimony or admitted by all. Among these are the world animate, and inanimate; and the magnificent furniture of the heavens. The vast magnitude and infinite number of the Creator's works speak the same language of power to all intelligent beings. Whilst the power of God, in the abstract, is universally acknowledged to be infinite; and the works, and operations of creatures admitted in demonstration thereof, there are two ways, by which preachers, in particular of certain orders, circumscribe or diminish it to nothing. One is, which seems to be paradoxical, by apparently magnifying the divine power beyond infinity or superadding power to that which is admitted infinite and even to add infinity to infinity.

It is customary for certain sectarian divines to preach to their hearers, that to convert one soul, from nature to grace, requires greater power than that which created the worlds. It required the power of God to create the world—thence, it requires more than the power of God to convert or save a soul, that is, more than infinite power. From such premises more than infinite power is required to perform some works. Were it denied, which I know not that it is, that to speak creation into being, and the worlds into operation, required infinite power, it is demanded how this is known? How can the Creator work with less than infinite power? If any of his works bespeak a power less than infinite, how is it known? If this were known, then finite minds could comprehend the works of God, who is infinite, which is an absurdity, and it would be the height of presumption in any man to pretend to such knowledge.

Supposing what such preachers say to be true, that the conversion of one sinner requires more power than was exercised in the creation; this excess of infinite power must be multiplied by the whole number of souls, that are changed, or that ever will be, by the power of sovereign grace. Infinity will be multiplied by almost an infinite number, unless the number of converted sinners are supposed to be less. A power greater than infinite implies more than a mere absurdity. It implies the conception of power to be as much less than the idea of infinity as it is absurdly imagined to be greater. There is evidence of this in those men, who make

the statement as above. The number of sinners, which they suppose will be saved by the sovereign grace of God of more than infinite power, is just as small in proportion to the whole of mankind, as that imagined excess of infinite power is small, compared with infinity. As salvation only requires power, and not damnation, and as the salvation of all mankind, or the world, requires no more than the power of God—those who preach the salvation of a part only, ordained to eternal life, have to take care, that as much more power than infinite shall be employed in the salvation of that part, as the number falls short of that of the whole human family. Sovereign grace, partial, as it is, agreeably to the sentiment just expressed, is nothing, or rather injustice and cruelty; so the super-almighty power, that is supposed to attend it, is nothing or weakness, united as it always is in the nature of things, with injustice and cruelty denominated tyranny in an earthly despot; vindictive justice, and divine vengeance when ascribed to the Almighty.

To acknowledge each and all the works of God, to be the production of infinite power, since their existence is only imperfectly comprehended by the human mind, is not irrational. If so, how is even an orthodox divine to determine between two incomprehensible things, which required the most incomprehensible power to perform it!

I have indeed heard one of those so called give as a reason, why the salvation of a sinner required more power than the creation of man, that, in the latter case, the power of God met with no opposition between the former, the stubborn will and impenitency of the vile sinner resisted the power of omnipotence; hence the inference that more than creating energy called into the service and aid of the Almighty. This reasoning plainly implies that if the will of the sinner was neither for nor against, his salvation, but entirely passive, that power which could create, would be sufficient to convert him from his state of native sinfulness; and that in order to subject to such power he must be both corrigible and penitent. But although a sinner be both corrigible and penitent, if his will be contrary, it will require more than creating power to break or subdue it. Since then more than Almighty power is necessary to effect the salvation of the penitent, what must be supposed equal to the work of saving an incorrigible and impenitent sinner? Here the inquirer is left in the darkness of despair, deserted by divines with their super-infinite power, or left to contemplate with the apathy they do, the picture of hell-torments presented to him for the incorrigible, and all this for the want of a power to help that which is more than super-infinite.

If such absurdity and mockery of divine power were the effect of a childish prejudice or were the ebullition of an imagination warmed with the subject that naturally breaks forth into hyperboles, it ought to be regarded without a look of severity, but from its coming so often, and so deliberately from the advocates of certain well-known, though otherwise strange doctrines, they ought to be frowned upon, and abandoned for the bad company which they keep. They ought to be abhorred if possible, more than evil itself, since they are found on the side of the enemy, in favour of the perpetual continuance of sin, and torment in spite of the power, wisdom and goodness of God.

ERASMUS.

A POPULAR RELIGION.

It is truly astonishing to witness the unceasing assiduity with which many people seek after a POPULAR RELIGION. It appears to be their "meat and their drink" to do that which will receive the applause, or meet the approbation, of the strongest party. As if the asseverations of Jehovah, the blood of his Son, the testimony of the prophets, or the sufferings of his primitive followers, were matters of little or no account, many, who profess to reverence the name of God, and love the truth as it is in Jesus, will spend and be spent, in trying to find out and obtain a reli-

gion, which shall be considered popular. To the candid observer, who stands aloof from the scene of action, and beholds the probable motives which govern the multitude, the way in which they go, and the ridiculous fooleries which they condescend to practice for the sake of popularity, all these "ways and means" appear so truly detestable, so vain, foolish, anti-christian and ridiculous, that it is hard to determine whether to weep, laugh, or groan at the condition of the world! That there are some who feel the importance of forsaking "father and mother, houses and lands" for the sake of truth and the gospel, is a fact which requires no proof; but that a majority of our citizens are governed by different motives is equally susceptible of demonstration.

Among those who are thus given to "run after strange gods," there are individuals of quite different characters and conditions, who are probably governed by different notions, but who have the one great object, popularity, in constant view. Among persons of the above description, are some, who, having found themselves low in the estimation of the world, have thought most advisable to forsake their former associates, and cling to others, with the hope of gaining friends by the exchange. There are, perhaps, many others, who, having little or no intrinsic merit of their own, and being sensible of their defect, will select some demi-god for a guide, and follow, with implicit obedience, in his wake, with the hope of being shielded from the evils of their former condition by the supposed greatness of their little deity. There are others whose attention, perhaps, is attracted by the parade, the show, the pomp, the grandeur, or possibly the external appearances of some religion. With such a large wig, a flowing robe, a guilt prayer-book, or a genteel parson, has more weight than all the sacred injunctions, the solemn oaths, the divine promises, or the weighty asseverations of the eternal God. To such, the imposing ceremonies, the "essential" ordinances, or the venerated formularies of faith, adopted by any sect—no matter which, provided it be popular, form the grand desideratum. The darling object is no sooner discovered by such persons, than every former profession is given to the winds; each former attachment is consigned to forgetfulness; and, peradventure, every former obligation under which they may have been placed, is considered "null and void," if not altogether oppressive and unjust. By slow but sure gradations, they work themselves into a belief, that every measure is done in compliance with duty, that every step is taken in wisdom, and that even heaven itself approves and sanctions their conduct. Such do not consider the pure and undefiled religion of God of primary consequence, but "step lightly o'er" the ashes of martyred christians, to kiss the garment's hem of some well-fed clerical dignitary, and to kneel, devotionally, before the cushioned altar of ostentatious wickedness.

But there are others among the group, which deserve more unqualified censure. Such are they, who, as pretended preachers of Christ, and followers of the Lamb of God, inculcate the lesson, that the practices above enumerated are praise-worthy. An unconquerable desire for a good living, a fat salary, an easy life, or to obtain the smiles of all, at the expense of moral honesty and pure religion, leads some, perhaps many, to lull the consciences, or flatter the pride of the world. Possibly, in the creed of an individual of this class, are found the words of partial grace, vindictive vengeance, and eternal despair: But each offensive paragraph is cautiously concealed, carefully expounded, or insidiously explained, to meet the views of several, and all of those who incline to swallow the golden bait! It remains for future years to develop the pernicious effects of this thirst for popularity, and for future generations to stigmatize such intolerable vanities, with the well deserved epithet, "full of all falsehood."

A man of rash, impetuous temper seldom reflects until it is too late to mend a bad action: But pru-

dence and precaution are the handmaids of true wisdom.

CONTENTMENT.

BY T. G. FESSENDEN.

Having food and raiment, let us therewith be content.

Art thou blest with food and raiment,
Give God thanks, for favours given;
Gratitude is all the payment
Thou canst make indulgent Heaven.

Clothing coarse, and scant subsistence,
Recompense which labour brings,
With contentment, make existence
Happier than the life of kings.

Why in heaping useless treasure,
Shorten life, and health destroy?
Where's the profit or the pleasure,
Hoarding what you ne'er enjoy?

Why, for Mammon's paltry proffers,
Sell thyself, to sin a slave,
Can the wealth, which swells thy coffers,
Buy exemption from the grave?

Since the thread of life is brittle,
Heed the poet's moral song,
"Man in this world needs but little,
And that little needs not long."

Wants by luxury created—
All of artificial kind,
By indulgence never sated,
Weaken and debase the mind.

To the hardy child of nature,
Decent clothes and frugal fare.
Furnish pure enjoyments greater,
Than the pampered monarchs share.

Gold by avarice that's hoarded,
Might as well be in the mine,
Wealth that's generously afforded,
Can alone be counted thine.

Then, if blest with food and raiment,
Let thy gratitude be shown,
No man's merits, as a claimant,
Give a right to these alone.

A STRANGE THING UNDER THE SUN.

We understand that a respectable member of a Baptist Church in this county, a stage proprietor, has been seriously "dealt with," by an aggrieved brother, for the crime of permitting an universalist preacher to ride 20 miles in his stage for the customary fare! But what is still worse, is the fact, that a complaint has been preferred against the same man and is now actually depending before the church, for the awful crime of conveying in his stage a number of young gentlemen and ladies to an evening party!! *Question.* Is there not something said in the bible about straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel?

It is thought, that the above mentioned church will probably disfellowship the shoemaker who manufactured the shoes which were worn by the young people to their social party! *Gospel Advocate.*

Let not your expectations from the years that are to come, rise too high; and your disappointments will be fewer, and more easily supported.

REYNOLDS THE PHILANTHROPIST.

A lady applied to him in behalf of an orphan after he had given liberally, she said, when he is old enough I will teach him to name and thank his benefactor. Stop, said the good man, thou art mista-

ken, we do not thank the clouds for the rain; teach him to look higher, and thank Him who giveth both the clouds and the rain.

MARRIED,

I Pawtuxet, on Monday morning last, by Rev. Mr. Shurtliff, Rev. E. G. Howe, of Illinois, to Miss Mary-Ann Condry, daughter of Capt. Thomas H. Condry.

In Cumberland, on the 14th inst. by Rev. Mr. Cutler, Mr. William Arnold, to Miss Lydia Earle.

In Warren, Captain Beriah G. Browning, of Bristol, to Miss Marian Willard, of the former place.

In Glocester, 14th inst. Mr. Samuel Aldrich, of Smithfield, to Miss Cynthia Winsor, daughter of Mr. Wm. Winsor, of G.

DIED,

In this town, 12th inst. Mary Frances, infant daughter of Mr. Avery Allen, aged 1 year and 11 months.

Same day, James Courtney, infant son of Mr. Stephen Burr.

On 11th inst. Mr. Gorham Dean, of Biddeford, Me. aged 22 years.

On Saturday morning last, Christopher Champin Dexter, Esq. aged 31 years.

On Monday morning, Julia Frances, child of Mr. Barnum Field, aged 7 months.

Same day, Harriet Gramont, daughter of Mr. Samuel Rawson, in her 5th year.

Same day, Frances Mary, infant daughter of Samuel G. Arnold, Esq.

On Sunday evening last, Miss Sally J. Arnold, daughter of the late Mr. Welcome Arnold, in the 19th year of her age.

On Wednesday evening last, Mrs. Sarah Bosworth, in the 40th year of her age.

On Tuesday last, Isaac Bowen, infant son of Mr. William Hamlin, aged 1 year.

On Tuesday, Mrs. Ruth Jones, in the 82d year of her age.

In Smithfield, 13th inst. Luke, son of Mr. Luke Burbank, aged about 18 months.

On the 16th inst. Mary, daughter of Mr. Benjamin Williams, aged about 18 months.

In Little-Compton, on Thursday week, of the typhus fever, Miss Mary-Ann Taylor, daughter of Mr. Simeon Taylor, in the 20th year of her age.

In Johnston, on Monday evening last, Mrs. Mary-Ann Chapin, wife of Mr. Amory Chapin, of this town, and daughter of Colonel Jeremiah Manton, aged 22 years.

In Scituate, on Thursday, George Jackson, infant son of Mr. John L. Hughes, aged 1 year.

SAMUEL W. WHEELER,

No. 110 1/2 WESTMINSTER-STREET,

Has just received, a Sermon on taking leave of the Second Universalist Church in the city of Philadelphia, April 10th, 1825. By Rev. William Morse.

Also, Rev. Mr. Stetson's Six Sermons, containing Remarks on Andrew Fuller's reasons for believing that the future punishment of the wicked will be endless. Price 25 cents. The tract, viz. "Andrew Fuller's reasons," which the author of these sermons professes to examine, has been industriously circulated in this part of New-England, and probably through the country. All we have to say is, "prove all things and hold fast that which is good."